UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

The Importance of Being Neutral Toward Spain

By Brent Dow Allinson

Federal Finance—Fact or Fiction? - - - - - - - - *Henry W. Pinkham*

We Live by All This Living World - *John Malick*

Totalitarian Pacifists - - *Ellen Horup*

My Russian Impressions, Part V - - - - - - - - - - *Rabindranath Tagore*

VOLUME CXIX NUMBER 1

Chicago, March 1, 1937

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Semi-Monthly *Subscription $3.00*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter May 24, 1935, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Board of Directors

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. IDA S. RANDALL
MR. JAMES E. TUCKER
ALSON H. ROBINSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
FRED W. SHORTER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
TARAKNATH DAS
PERCY M. DAWSON
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL—
Notes 3
Jottings—J. H. H. 6
ARTICLES—
The Importance of Being Neutral Toward Spain—BRENT DOW ALLINSON 6
Federal Finance—Fact or Fiction?—HENRY W. PINKHAM 9
We Live by All This Living World—JOHN MALICK 11
Totalitarian Pacifists—ELLEN HORUP 12
My Russian Impressions, V—RABINDRANATH TAGORE (Translated by Basanta Koomar Roy) 14
TRUMPETS ON NEW HORIZONS—
Heart Thirst—ELIZABETH VOSS 10
War—STANTON A. COBLENTZ 10
World Peace—SARAH LOIS GRIME 10
Voice of Man—CHARLES GUSTAV GIRELIUS 10
POETRY—
The Pulpit—*William Cowper* 3
Tom Mooney—EDWIN BARLOW EVANS 13
THE STUDY TABLE—
A Voice from the South—ALICE STONE BLACKWELL 16
CORRESPONDENCE—
In Reply to the Editor and Rivera—MORRIS TOPCHEVSKY 17
The Thomas Paine Number 18
THE FIELD—
An Example for Hindu Princes and Their Advisers—M. K. GANDHI 2
American Notes—SYDNEY STRONG 19

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

An Example for Hindu Princes and Their Advisers

By M. K. Gandhi

The Travancore Durbar have earned the congratulations of the whole Hindu world, and all thoughtful men, by issuing the following proclamation:

"Profoundly convinced of the truth and validity of our religion, believing that it is based on divine guidance and on all-comprehending toleration, knowing that in its practice it has throughout the centuries adapted itself to the need of the changing times, solicitous that none of our Hindu subjects should, by reason of birth, caste or community be denied the consolation and solace of the Hindu faith, we have decided and hereby declare, ordain and command that, subject to such rules and conditions as may be laid down and imposed by us for preserving their proper atmosphere and maintaining their rituals and observations, there should henceforth be no restriction placed on any Hindu by birth or religion on entering or worshipping at temples controlled by us and our Government."

The action has been long overdue. But better late than never. It may be said without pride that the way for the great step was prepared by the gentle but persistent effort of the Travancore branch of the Harijan Sevak Sangh, headed by Shri K. Paramwaren Pillai. The workers of the Sangh had awakened the conscience of the Savarna Hindus who had sent numerous petitions to the Durbar praying for the opening of the State temples to Harijans on the same terms as they were to Caste Hindus. Untouchability, though an excrescence, has taken such hold of the Hindu world that, whenever a Hindu breaks through it and declares against it, he excites admiration among reformers and becomes the object of fierce criticism from the orthodox. This is much more so when the action is taken by one in high authority as H. H. the Maharajah of Travancore, an ancient orthodox Hindu State. Let us hope all criticism will be hushed before this well thought out, deliberate act of piety and justice.

Let us hope, too, that no attempt will be made to whittle away the hard-earned freedom of Harijans by hedging round it by the least distinction between one

(*Continued on Page* 19)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXIX MONDAY, MARCH 1, 1937 No. 1

THE PULPIT

I say the pulpit (in the sober use
Of its legitimate, peculiar powers)
Must stand acknowledged, while the world shall stand,
The most important and effectual guard,
Support, and ornament of virtue's cause.
There stands the messenger of truth. There stands
The legate of the skies; his theme divine,
His office sacred, his credentials clear.
By him, the violated law speaks out
Its thunders, and by him, in strains as sweet
As angels use, the Gospel whispers peace.
He establishes the strong, restores the weak,
Reclaims the wanderer, binds the broken heart,
And, armed himself in panoply complete
Of heavenly temper, furnishes with arms
Bright as his own, and trains by every rule
Of holy discipline, to glorious war,
The sacramental hosts of God's elect.

William Cowper

THE PRESIDENT AND THE SUPREME COURT

The President's suggested reform of the Supreme Court does two things. First, it "packs" the court in the interest of the New Deal. Secondly, it attacks the question of retirement for age, though why it meets it indirectly and evasively, instead of directly and honestly after the pattern of Taft's suggestion of retirement at 70 and Hughes's of retirement at 75, is a mystery. But the reform leaves the essential problem of the court and its absolute jurisdiction exactly where it was at the start. We have the same Court, though it may be larger, with exactly the same degree of final authority. What may very well defeat the Roosevelt measure is the smart-aleck idea of supplementing the six old judges with six younger ones. This has an air of silliness about it, to say nothing of hypocrisy, and the public is beginning to laugh. Imagine trying to find a younger and better man to team up with Justice Brandeis, or a more vigorous intellect to match that of Chief Justice Hughes! And why are judges thus alone to be favored with the assistance of juvenile associates? Why not cabinet officers and senators and representatives? Surely there are many men in Washington who must be feeling slighted—a senile septuagenarian, like Borah for example, or a petrified patriarch like Norris! There are other and wiser ways of dealing with the Supreme Court problem, granting that it must be dealt with at all. Senator Borah, in his great radio speech, laid down the fundamental principle of change when he reminded the nation that, in a democracy, responsibility lies with the people. The Constitution, in other words, provides for the remedying of defects in its institutions, by due process of amendment. Norman Thomas offers a specific suggestion in the so-called Hillquit Amendment which extends and defines the power of Congress to deal with economic and social problems of national concern. Morris Ernst, in his new book, *The Ultimate Power,* points out constructive proposals which go back to Madison and the Federal Convention. These very advocates of change are all alienated by the President's fantastic idea. Even Raymond Moley is against it! There is scattered support among certain liberals who feel, perhaps not without reason, the desirability of quick action to meet present needs, but if the President's bill passes Congress, it will be through the action of party whips and hacks who come to heel whenever the White House speaks. It is a curious and disturbing situation. If the Supreme Court problem had to be dealt with, why not in a forthright and fundamental way? We expect to see growing opposition to the President's scheme based on the conviction that the President has outsmarted himself and the country.

CAN WE KEEP OUT OF IT?

War seems to be drawing mighty near these days —a sweeping European war sprung from Spain like Minerva from the brow of Jove. If it comes, will this country be able to keep out of it? The administration is wisely taking every precaution for safety, as does the wise shipmaster when he sees the storm lowering upon the horizon. The neutrality law, for example, is being rewritten in water-tight fashion, so that nothing can get through to belligerents either in an international or a civil war. But suppose the European cataclysm actually breaks upon us. Then suppose that this country, in accordance with its neutrality legislation, should steadfastly refuse to allow citizens to sell to the countries at war. There would be no trouble, we believe, over munitions or even airplanes. But we would also have to shut down on cotton and wheat and cattle, and the price of these and all other such commodities would immediately go down. Whereupon, says one of the best informed men in our acquaintanceship in Washington, in a private letter, "the most powerful lobby in America, the farmers, would immediately drive on Washington to lift the embargo. Self-interest is number one yet!" There you have it! Nor are the farmers the only ones who would be clamoring for trade. They would be vigorously joined by the large groups of those who, in any European war, would be sympathetic with one side or the other of the conflict, and desirous of lending aid. Even so-called pacifists at this moment are trying to send supplies and even men to Spain. Get the profit-motive hitched up with unthinking idealism, and you have a formidable combination. In the face of such a drive, it would take more influence than has yet been mobilized to hold this country safely outside the battle-line. The more reason, therefore, for immediate, persistent, and uncompromising agitation on behalf of neutrality and peace at any price! The peace forces of the nation are not as active or as forthright as they should be in this vast emergency. Now or never is the time to build the bulwarks against war.

THE CHURCH BLESSES WAR AGAIN

Did the church learn anything in the last war? We have been thinking so, or at least hoping so. But now comes the news that the Church of England Assembly in London has adopted resolutions supporting Great Britain's preparedness policy. More significant than the resolutions was the debate preceding their adoption. Thus, the Archbishop of York contended that "it can be a Christian duty to kill," and that therefore "Christian citizens may fight in the service of their country." This brings us right back to where we started in 1914—the "duty to kill" our enemies, which means anybody outside our country who gets in our way! It was "our duty to kill" Germans in 1914 in the interest of peace and democracy, and now it is our "duty to kill" Fascists, or perhaps Communists, in the same interest. The Right Rev. Arthur F. Winnington Ingram, Bishop of London, got so excited about this "duty to kill," that he warned "the real dangers to the peace of the world today are pacifists." Certainly!—not those who say it is our "duty to kill," but those who say it is our duty *not* to kill, these are responsible for all the killing!! This, we suppose, is Christian logic! How it is any different from Fascist logic, so far as the practical outcome is concerned, is more than we can see. Fortunately, the dicta of these bloodthirsty men of God did not go unchallenged. The redoubtable and indomitable "Dick" Sheppard was on hand to declare:

> "We believe that a bomb with a label on it, 'With love from Geneva,' is no less devastating and no more Christian than one dropped by this or that dictator."

We think of a possible war between England and Germany, and Berlin or London, or both, blown to atoms by enemy bombing planes! What difference does it make to the civilians annihilated, or to the future of mankind, or to the mind of God, whether the missiles were dropped by one side or the other? Both sides are moved by the "duty to kill," and together pronounce upon mankind the doom of death. It's dastardly business, made only worse by the use of Christian piety to hide the lineaments of murder.

THE MOONEY CASE—DON'T BE DISCOURAGED!

We had not intended to comment upon the latest development in the Mooney case, so clearly had we thought its nature understood. Everybody knew, so we believed, that the referee appointed by the California Supreme Court to review the case would sustain the adverse verdict of the court which selected him—and this is exactly what he has done! Had he done otherwise, the shock might have killed us all. For if anything has been clear from the beginning it is that California is going to keep Mooney in jail to the very end of its ability to do so. Yet the papers have been filled with expressions of surprise and commendable indignation that this one more betrayal of justice has occurred! As a matter of fact, while there is abundant reason for indignation always, there is no reason on this occasion for surprise, least of all for despair. We are getting ahead, slowly but surely. What has happened is this! Last year the Supreme Court in Washington, now so bitterly assailed as the obstacle to all justice and the right, heard appeal on the Mooney case, expressed obvious sympathy with the appeal, but pointed out as a matter of law that remedies in the case had not been exhausted in the state courts. The Mooney lawyers were counselled that the Supreme Court could not intervene until these remedies as laid down in the statutes had been exhausted. If in the end they failed, then let Mooney come again to Washington! So now the ball of legal procedure is being unrolled to the end. First, the referee—who has now been heard and is out of the

way. Next, the California court again to hear arguments on the referee's opinion, and to accept or reject it. The court will accept it, without any question, and the last door in California thus be shut in Mooney's face. *Then,* the way is at last clear to Washington, and the Supreme Court will hear and answer. So we are making progress. The time lost is terrible; the money expended is serious; the stress and strain on Mooney's spirit must be indescribable. But he will yet be free—and California forever damned in the conscience of mankind and the judgment of history.

ELIHU ROOT

Not in years has there been heard such a paean of praise as followed upon the death of Elihu Root. We cannot join our voice to the chorus of adulation. We agree that Mr. Root was a man of surpassing intellect. We imagine that his was one of the greatest legal minds of his generation. We concede that, as senator and cabinet minister, he was one of the ablest politicians ever seen in Washington. But how did he use his gifts?—that is the question. For acts of creative statesmanship, for words of liberating inspiration, for causes of human progress and enlightenment, for the common people that they might be saved from exploitation and oppression? In none of these things was he eminent, or even interested. Elihu Root was brilliant exclusively within the bounds of class, party, professional and national life. He was conventional to the point of complete extinction of all moral impulse and idealism. Thus, as a man he was attached by every fibre of his being to the highly privileged group in society which preyed under the protection of law and custom on the helpless workers. As a lawyer he was the advocate of the rights which sustained the wealth and honor of his class, and the willingly paid attorney for anybody, from a corrupt Tammany politician to a corruptive corporation magnate, who wanted to know how to work his wiles safely inside the law. As a statesman, he dedicated, to paraphrase Lowell, high talents which were meant for mankind to the ignoble service of party. In his official labors, in cabinet and senate, he kept to those utterly conventional ways which lead and arrive nowhere. Thus, he has been applauded for his work on behalf of international peace, yet, in the light of the peace problem as we now understand it, his work was as innocent of reality as the play-fancies of a little child. Elihu Root, one of the last survivors of the pre-War age into our post-War time, is seen now to have been only one of the most eminent practitioners of that highly respectable futility which was characteristic of the generation gone. He never grasped the living forces of his era, and in utter selfishness sought to perpetuate the self-regarding interests of his possessing group. He had no standards better than hypocritical convention, and in all his life he never did a generous or sacrificial thing. If we are living today on the very verge of social collapse, it is among other things because we are the victims of a world which could regard an Elihu Root as one of its greatest leaders.

RELEASE OF THE UNTOUCHABLES—AND THE INDIAN CONGRESS!

We are publishing this week in our department, "The Field," an article by Mahatma Gandhi in his paper, *Harijan,* about a matter of sensational significance in India which has received no proportionate attention at all here in America. We refer to the action of the Travancore Durbar some months ago in opening the Hindu temples in the province to the Untouchables. It is of course well-known that, for some years past, Gandhi has been giving his life to these Untouchables. As a part of the great work of independence for India —independence from bondage within as well as bondage without—the Mahatma is undertaking the greatest single movement of emancipation known to history. Sixty millions of these outcasts exist miserably in India, and Gandhi would lift them up and make them equal partners in the great Indian family. It is a prodigious task, with the tradition of ages and the harsh barriers of the caste-system all against it. But Gandhi is not one easily to be deterred, and in recent years he has been living in the villages making the cause of the lowliest workers all his own. To many of us this marks the noblest and in the end perhaps the most effective period of the Mahatma's great career. Now comes a great Indian prince, H. H. the Maharajah of Travancore, an ancient orthodox Hindu state, and at one stroke swings wide the temple doors to the Untouchables and therewith places them on an equal plane with their fellow-men and with their gods. We know of nothing to compare with this since Alexander II emancipated the serfs of Russia. But the deed in India is mixed with no political considerations, and is thus a purer and nobler thing. What must follow upon this event—who may say? Gandhi makes it plain in his article that he hopes for great things. Meanwhile, the close of another year brings another meeting of the Indian National Congress! We commend the reports of this Congress to any who believe that Mahatma Gandhi is losing his power over the Indian masses, or that the independence movement is over. Nehru, militant and heroic leader, stands shoulder to shoulder with Gandhi in the service of the one great cause of freedom for India. The day when the new constitution is supposed to take effect, April 1, may well be fateful for the Empire.

Jottings

Recent events are giving us a new definition of *Suicide*—"to ride in an airplane."

Lloyd-George has written six huge volumes to prove that he was right in the War, and everybody else was wrong. Before such sublime assurance, the dogma of papal infallibility grows wan and pale.

Do Malaga grapes come from Malaga, Spain? If so, the horrors of the fighting in and about that city would seem to lend poignancy to the prophet's famous words—"The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge." Alas, that fathers should sin, and generations yet unborn pay the price!

A new heir to the throne of Italy is like another cipher added to a row of ciphers. We have the King —O; then there is his son, Humbert—O; and now there is the Prince of Naples, just born—O. Three ciphers, OOO—and they amount, in these days of Il Duce, to just exactly nothing at all.

Italian universities have been authorized to confer post mortem Ph. D. degrees on students who died in the Ethiopian war. It touches us to think what comfort these degrees will be to those dead boys. Why not carry this excellent idea farther. Authorize priests to give them post mortem wives, for example? Anything, everything—except only post mortem life!

We used to think of labor as one of the great influences for peace. But now we recall that all this stupendous arming of the nations is being done by—workers! Munitions, guns, ships, bombing planes, all being made by—*workers!* It makes us wonder why we do not more often remember that the hated munition-makers include not merely the Du Ponts and the Krupps but the workers they employ.

J. H. H.

The Importance of Being Neutral Toward Spain

BRENT DOW ALLINSON

The tragic convulsion of Spain is not yet over—nor the international mischief and imperialistic intrigue of which it is an expression. It is precisely this kind of intrigue and deviltry which still frustrates the League of Nations, and which defeated the moral and political aims of the American people in their intervention in the World War. It will, presumably, always defeat our good intentions, until a super-national federation of nations is attained, accompanied by the disarmament of its several powerful units, in which it will be safe for America and for democracy to participate. It is apparent today that public opinion in the United States is more than ever united in its resolution not to permit any President or Secretary of State to entangle us in the obscure power-politics, shifting alliances and perennial collisions, of the armed governments of Europe; and in the face of this situation and resolution, it is more than ever important to define and to pursue an honest and a strict neutrality.

All that glitters as neutrality is not, however, golden. The facts are complex, and the incidence of what is done by Executive action or even legislative determination, unless it is very carefully and thoughtfully done, may result in great injury to others, and even in unneutral service and unintended intervention. Such, we fear, was the hasty action of the present Congress in enacting a joint resolution prohibiting the exportation of arms and implements of war to Spain in the midst of civil war; for the principal effect of that action was without warning to cut off the republican government of Spain from a source of arms necessary to its defense or survival. Such, still more certainly, was the effect—and probably the intended effect—of similar embargoes placed, three months ago, by the British Government (without debate or action by Parliament), upon the exportation of arms and implements of war from Great Britain, for use in Spain; for the military, Fascist *junta* have been steadily receiving arms, ammunition, military airplanes and tanks—quite probably of British origin, in part, and more certainly expedited by British financial loans and credits—from Germany; whereas the Socialist-Anarchist republic was thereby cut off suddenly from both arms and financial aid from Great Britain, without prior warning and in the face of the fact that the prevailing conception and rules of international law, outside of the United States, permit a warring government—and certainly one engaged in a defensive war—to purchase and freely export, so far as its financial, military and naval circumstances and power permit, arms and munitions of war from neutral countries without compromising their neutrality. That the United States Congress and the American people have initiated an important and indeed an historic endeavor to alter the law and to repress and restrain the deadly international traffic in arms between neutral and belligerent states, and to undertake to prohibit them as a part of the New Neutrality of the future, does not alter the foregoing statement, because the notable American initiative has not yet become explicitly accepted as conventional and living international law. And at the recent important inter-American Conference at Buenos Aires there was evidence of British influence at work to defeat that admirable undertaking. But, of course, this was to be expected from the arbitrary mistress of the seas, whose principal weapon is the abominable starvation-blockade, which all the laws of God and man condemn.

There were important aspects of the recent furore over certain large and mysterious purchases of discarded United States Army airplanes and other military machinery, by private munitions-brokers of uncertain connections (particularly the Vimalert Company, of New Jer-

sey) intended for shipment—and so licensed by the State Department under the Neutrality Acts—which escaped the notice of the press and of many persons who are supposed to understand the implications and operations of the new Neutrality program, twice enacted by Congress and duly proclaimed by the President as the official policy and law of the United States, aiming to achieve and maintain a fair and honest neutrality towards all nations involved in war, or civil war,—but entangling alliances with none.

Let us look at the record—and the facts. The shipment under question was indubitably a shipment of unconditional contraband of war—airplane engines being included in the list of items regarded as arms and implements of war issued by the President to give effect and administration to the Neutrality Act; and by the League of Nations in the Treaty for the licensing and Control of the Arms Traffic, signed by the United States in Geneva, in 1925, (and ratified unexpectedly by the Senate, in 1935). But it happens that the shipment licensed to the Vimalert Company is destined for use of a constitutionally elected and legal government of a country with which the United States is at peace and upon friendly terms,—a government which "is engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that government, or any government so conceived and constituted, can long survive" in the Spanish Peninsula beset by the violent attacks of Fascism and of a group of highly placed army officers, who seized possession of the barracks and arsenals of the nation, betrayed their oaths of allegiance to the Constitution, and launched a concerted military uprising to overthrow both government and constitution, with the aid of their colonial battalions of illiterate and ferocious Moors from Morocco, and the illicit support of foreign munitions, technicians, money, and mercenaries, from Italy and Germany.

Were this an "ordinary" civil war, or rebellion against a legitimate government of a friendly country, no question or excitement would arise as to the propriety of a shipment of arms, for the reason that the long-established practice of this and other civilized neutral governments has been to permit free-trade in arms and munitions of war, both in time of peace and even of foreign war. Not until the historic passage of the recent American Neutrality Acts, instigated by the pointed endeavors of Senators Nye, Bone, Vandenberg, Clark, and Thomas, and their confrères of the Munitions Committee, had any modern government undertaken by legislation to proclaim and enact a new conception of international neutral duty and morality, and to enforce embargoes against its own citizens and exporters who desired to traffic in arms and implements of war with representatives of foreign governments engaged in international war, in violation of the Kellogg-Briand Pact—of which, indeed, the new Neutrality Act of the United States has become the first potent implementation.

This American law and policy has raised a new standard of national conduct and international duty to which, as Washington once said about a similar undertaking, "the wise and honest may repair," and which has just received the official confirmation and acclaim of most of the other republican governments of this Hemisphere, represented at the Buenos Aires Conference. But the question now arises whether anything in the new code of neutral duties, designed to preserve the honor and peace of neutral nations by requiring economic as well as political non-intervention in alien conflicts, has any application to, or is in any proper sense involved in, a case of tragic rebellion and devastating civil strife within a foreign and a friendly country. And secondarily—but of great importance—whether any attempt of the United States Government (or other neutral governments), suddenly to change its established policy and law of free-trade, or *laissez-faire* and *laissez-passer,* in arms and war-materials towards a government beset with domestic rebellion—or towards the insurrectionists, for that matter—and to do this in the midst of the conflict, constitutes, in effect if not in motive, *an act of intervention,* to the injury of one party. In the case of the present licensed shipments of airplane-engines, the change of policy would work—and did work, when a similar change was made by the British Government, without warning—a very grave injury to the elected government of Spain. If we now commit the same offense, work the same injury, and establish the precedent of altering long-established policy and law, in the midst of conflict, *in medias res,* whether it is done by Presidential discretion or congressional enactment, may it not constitute, constructively at least, an unneutral act which we shall keenly regret under different circumstances that may arise in the future?

It is a well-known and well-established principle of civil and international law that regulations and laws may neither be enacted and applied *ex post facto,* nor altered in the midst of controversies. Freedom of trade to all—even in arms and munitions of war—has been the law and policy of this country, and of other industrial countries, in time of peace; and even of war, save as modified by the laws of war and previously enacted neutrality statutes. We may now soon come to see and believe that prohibition of all exportation of arms and the fabricated implements and ammunitions of war may be desirable at all times, as a permanent policy of this and other civilized governments, tending to promote the better order and peace of the world. If so, let us not hesitate to enact a permanent prohibition of arms-exportation as the considered policy of the United States; and let us seek to bring other countries to the same standard and enactment, making the prohibition applicable to all states and citizens, at all times. This would unquestionably be consistent with the truest neutrality; and quite certainly would advance the disarmament and promote the peace of the world. But, until we do this, the only argument that will stand the test of reason for prohibiting the shipment of arms or airplane engines, now under discussion, to Spain, rests on the supposition that the present tragic domestic conflict in that unhappy country has ceased to be a domestic disturbance, and become, in fact if not in name, an international conflict because of the support of the rival armies by foreign powers—Fascist or Socialistic; and that it has become an international conflict between opposing conceptions of life and the State—despite the well-recognized rules of international law that forbid military intervention of governments and states in domestic disturbances of foreign countries and certainly forbid informal, unofficial, and unacknowledged intervention.

This principle of sound international law and duty has just been reaffirmed in categorical terms by the United States, at Buenos Aires. All the more reason, therefore, why we should be very careful not to act hastily towards the present conflict in Spain in a man-

ner which would constitute, in effect, intervention, disadvantageous to one side, and that the side for which we feel some constitutional and moral obligation—whatsoever crimes and errors other governments may have committed. The United States is not a party to the non-intervention agreements, and is not represented on the international committee with headquarters in London. It is notorious, moreover, that the efforts of Lord Plymouth's committee to stop the shipments of munitions and the sending of soldiers and military technicians to Spain have been up to the present disgracefully ineffectual, and have been widely flouted, particularly by Germans and the German and Italian governments and perhaps by Soviet Russia and France. It is widely rumored and believed, moreover, that London has financed, directly and indirectly, the principal munitions that have reached the rebels. And the Spanish rebellion is not yet an international conflict in American law, or in the eyes of our State Department, despite the fact that the belligerency of General Franco's military faction has been somewhat prematurely acknowledged by the German and Italian Governments—for reasons of their own.

If the appalling catastrophe in Spain were a "domestic disturbance" within the meaning of our earlier statutes authorizing the President to impose embargoes against the export of arms and military supplies to American nations, or nations in which the United States exercises extra-territorial jurisdiction, the Executive would already possess, under those statutes, ample authority to lay down effective embargoes against American aid to that party, or faction, causing the disturbance—namely, in this case, the Fascist-monarchist military clique headed by General Franco—but not against the legitimately elected government. Since Spain does not fall within either of these categories embraced by the earlier embargo-statutes, of which the new Neutrality Act is but a logical amplification, these embargoes under our laws and established policy do not and cannot apply, without an alteration of our basic policy of free-trade in arms-exports to all-comers not engaged in international war; and exporters of war-materials—disregarding the ethics of their surreptitious and mischievous traffic—are legally entitled to export arms and ammunition to one or both sides of any civil war abroad, and they have repeatedly done so—to South America, China, and to Europe, including Spain—despite the impotent "moral suasion" and disapprobation of the newly-created Munitions Licensing Office in the State Department.

This, then, is the importance of the issue in the present embarrassing case! If Congress now hastily enacts a provision applying the embargoes of the Neutrality Act to cases of foreign civil wars and domestic disturbances, without discrimination as to the justice of the controversy (and without determining the basic question of prohibiting arms-exports at all times, as a permanent policy), we may discover, in a few months or years, that we have cut off a principal source of aid and of arms from revolutionaries against one or another of the tyrannies and contemporary despotisms of Europe and Asia, with whose cause the American people might have the liveliest sympathies, recognizing in them the true champions of liberty, democracy, and peace. It is difficult, therefore, to regard such exportation of arms (and even of airplane engines) as "unpatriotic,"—so long as free-trade in arms remains the law and policy of the United States and other civilized governments. It is equally difficult to find any convincing reason why the licensing of such exports to either side in Spain may be termed "unneutral" service. On the contrary, as the legal experts see it, and as Senator Vandenberg has properly pointed out, to change our law and estop such shipments in the midst of a war, or rebellion, without advance notice to all—would lead to dangerous misunderstandings, and might actually constitute unneutral service and action, for which damages might later be assessed against the United States Government by a court of arbitration, if the claim were pressed by the injured party or government.

If, however, the war in Spain has become, in fact, or in the eyes of other powers, an international conflict—by reason of the recognition of the belligerency of General Franco's *junta* by certain governments, and their open assistance to him—the President has but to exercise his considered judgment and to make a public proclamation of his finding to that effect. In such event, all the mandatory embargoes and penalties provided by the existing Neutrality statutes would automatically and at once become effective; and no arms or implements of war could then be lawfully exported, directly or indirectly, for use by either side; and no loans or credits could be advanced by Americans. Even were the President merely to recognize the belligerency of General Franco's faction, it is conceivable that the same result would legally ensue,—i.e., positive prohibition of all exports of arms, ammunition or implements of war, including airplane engines—as defined by the Executive order of last March—to either faction or government in Spain.

With these facts and considerations in view, it would appear that the President has ample authority to act, and to act wisely under the law. Why, under these circumstances, does he, or anyone else, think that amendment of the "mandatory" Neutrality Act is necessary, in order to give him increased discretion, and to open the way to enormous and interested pressures upon him to act in a way desired by the friends of one, or the other, contending factions rather than for the defense of the integrity, authority, and peace of the United States of America, and for the maintenance of its honest neutrality towards the miserable wars of others—which it has not caused and cannot, by its own separate action, prevent?

The debates in the Senate will be interesting to hear; but unless this point is frankly and fully argued, and answered, we can see no good reason for changing the law. On the contrary, we see many reasons in the whole episode for a permanent and mandatory type of neutrality legislation, embracing sweeping embargoes against war-materials and munitions, if not for a permanent prohibition of the exportation of all arms and fabricated lethal weapons to foreign nations and factions engaged in conflict, whether or not declared and qualified as "war." And every reason to hope that the new national policy, twice enacted by the Congress and widely acclaimed by public opinion, will at long last be accepted by the State Department and made the keystone of its new pan-American political architecture. To the great regret of many close students of this vital matter, nothing whatever was accomplished in this direction at the recent confabulation at Buenos Aires, as the texts of the conventions, recently received in Washington, dishearteningly reveal.

Federal Finance— Fact or Fiction?

HENRY W. PINKHAM

Governor Landon said that "when"—not if—he should be elected President he would balance the budget. Unfortunately—or fortunately?—we shall never know whether or not he would have done it. President Roosevelt has promised a balanced budget as soon as possible, but justifies the policy followed thus far of incurring a tremendous national debt, even asserting that it would have been a crime to balance the budget in the depth of the depression. In this connection the depression is often likened to war. War is financed largely by bond issues. Why not provide relief for the unemployed and the impoverished in the same way? The analogy is just. If the bond method is best for the one disaster, probably it is for the other also.

Whether it be on account of a war or of a depression, what really occurs when the government issues bonds? The prevailing opinion is that by this means the burden of paying for the extraordinary expenditures is postponed, passed on to the future, an obligation to be met by our children, perhaps our children's children. This common notion is completely mistaken. What truly takes place was stated in 1924 by an excellent authority, none other than the then great Secretary of the Treasury, Andrew W. Mellon. Discussing the war bonds, he said:

"From the viewpoint of the country as a whole the war was paid for when it was fought. The equipment, munitions, food, clothing and all other materials and supplies necessary for carrying on the war had to be produced before they could be utilized. If the war had been financed entirely through taxation, as some suggested at the time, or if the supplies needed by the government had simply been commandeered and not paid for, it can readily be seen that the whole burden of the war would have been borne at that time. . . .

The financing of the conflict in part by loans was simply an arrangement under government supervision whereby those who were in position to do so could pay more than their proper proportion of the cost and be reimbursed later with interest by those who were not in a position at that time to meet their proper proportion under the tax system without too great sacrifices and hardships. What constitutes an asset to the one group in the form of government obligations is in effect an equal liability on the other group in the form of a tax lien on their future earnings. The government is simply an intermediary or agent who collects from the debtor and pays the creditor."

An indisputable statement of fact, and most admirably frank! It is self-evident that soldiers must have real bread to eat, real shoes to wear, real guns to shoot. Bread from wheat grown twenty years later when certain bonds become due will not avail, nor shoes nor guns manufactured by a future generation. "The war was paid for when it was fought," paid for in full, not only "from the viewpoint of the country as a whole," but from the viewpoint of reality, of things as they are. The same is true of public relief of the unemployed or of sufferers from drought or flood; it is fully paid for at the time, inescapably. Nature demands pay in advance for everything she yields. The idea that through bond issues payment is put off is mere fiction, a mischievous delusion.

Mr. Mellon's explanation of what actually happens cannot be questioned: the government collects by taxation money for the bondholders. Bonds may be bequeathed, and thus some members of the next generation will inherit a legal claim on the earnings of their fellow citizens who for their part will inherit the privilege of paying this tribute, all on account of a war or a depression years before they were born. Mr. Mellon's justification of the preposterous system is that it enables the poorer citizens to pay in the long run—perhaps through their children and grandchildren—their "proper proportion," which they could not do at the time, "not being in a position to do so without too great sacrifices and hardships." "Angels and ministers of grace, defend us!" One would like to ask this very rich man what determines the "proper proportion" if it is not the ability to pay. Should the poor man pay as much as the rich man? I trow not. It seems to me that those who buy bonds, being "in a position to do so," do not thereby pay any more than their "proper proportion" as compared with the less well-to-do, those "not in a position to do so," nor should they at the expense of the poorer be "reimbursed later with interest." In other words, the financing of a war or a depression should correspond to the fact that it must inevitably be paid for at the time. That is to say, the government, instead of issuing bonds, should issue only tax-receipts. The bond method means that in the end the poor pay more than their "proper proportion." The "proper proportion" is measured by ability to pay at the time since somehow, at the time and not later, in terms of actualities, payment must be made. Pay-as-you-go is always the fact. Postpone-payment-by-a-bond-issue is only fiction.

When our country was in the World War social pressure led many who were hardly "in a position to do so" to buy bonds, often by installments, who soon had to dispose of them, perhaps at a discount. Never before had government bonds been so widely distributed. But in a short time they were held by a small minority of the population. To this minority the masses pay tribute year after year. So will it be with the bonds issued on account of the depression. The ultimate effect of this method of financing an emergency is a further concentration of wealth already maldistributed with outrageous inequality and injustice.

Taxes are unpopular. But I can imagine a public opinion that would make a big tax-bill a matter of pride. In one of the high pressure bond-selling campaigns of the World War, Mr. Alvan T. Fuller, then a U. S. Representative, afterwards Governor of Massachusetts, was reported to have bought a million dollars' worth of bonds at a time. There was a general feeling that he deserved credit for notable patriotism and public spirit. Yet he had a "lien on the future earnings" of his countrymen for the full amount with interest. Suppose the government had taken that sum from him by taxation, inasmuch as he was "in a position" to spare it "without too great sacrifices and hardships." Then his million-dollar tax receipt might well have been prized, framed under glass, and cherished as a trophy. But a rich man should be ashamed to accept bonds in return for the help he is able to give when his country is in distress.

In time of war we have the conscription of men for the business of collective homicide. Our government dared that in 1917, even sending our boys across the ocean to kill and be killed on foreign soil thousands of miles away. But it did not dare the conscription of wealth, that is, financing the war "entirely through taxation," a legal and practicable procedure as well as reasonable and just,—practicable, at any rate, if only

the public understood the operation of war bonds as Mr. Mellon has explained it.

In the late campaign neither of the major candidates dared to suggest the immediate balancing of the budget by increased taxation. But, once the truth about bonds is perceived, evidently that is what ought to be done. Federal finance should face the fact, not fool with a fiction. And factually the war was paid for when it was fought, and the relief made necessary by the depression has been paid for to date. The bonds mean only that in the future the multitude will be mulcted for the benefit of the few. Therefore I say: No more bonds for a war or a depression! Only tax receipts!

If a government were realistic enough—preferring fact to fiction—to finance a war entirely by taxation, probably the war would stop as soon as it started—if not before! For while legislators may draft mere men and get away with it amid popular frenzy, drafting property is not so glamorously exciting, not half so safe for an office-holder who desires reëlection. Similarly, if straightway the budget should be balanced by whatever increased and widespread taxation is necessary, a tax-conscious public, unlike a bond-owning group, would not tolerate boondoggling, waste, and graft.

All but a very, very few of those who heard President Roosevelt, in one of his late campaign radio speeches, assert with satisfaction that it was only upon annual incomes exceeding $26,000 that taxation had increased, must have viewed such a fact as quite remote—$26,000, indeed! Not half the families in the United States have an income as high as $1,200 a year. Why not increase the tax on moderate incomes, rather than resort to hidden taxation and mountainous debt which ultimately put the heaviest burdens on the poor, though the poor do not know it? All incomes between the two limits mentioned, as well—of course—as those above the higher limit, should carry properly graduated taxes. There would then be a general tax-awareness, a most salutary factor of good government. Taxation would further a more just distribution of wealth. "Let none have cake till all have bread." In particular, ground rent, a value created by the community, should be drawn upon by the community. Somehow, by hook or by crook, the budget ought to be balanced at once, inasmuch as somehow, by hook or by crook, the depression has already been paid for to date, and is being inevitably paid for fully day by day.

Said wise Bishop Butler: "Things are what they are, and the consequences of them will be what they will be. Why, then, should we desire to be deceived?"

Trumpets on New Horizons

Heart Thirst

My heart, like a summer tree
  Is snarled in a web of heat.
Both thirst for life-giving showers
  In cool and silken sheet.

But my soul, like a winter bird
  Desires what the world cannot give,
I must turn toward Heaven and find
  Through Him the Food that will live.

ELIZABETH VOSS.

War

I saw the world, a scarlet orb that blazed
With smoke-wreaths coiling through the smoldering air;
And sea and land, beneath that blood-lit glare,
Were shrivelled and ensanguined as I gazed.
Pavilions, castles, theatres were razed
Like scraps of tinsel splendor; everywhere
Cities and peoples withered in a flare
Of puffing fire; while one that stumbled crazed,
Bull-horned, with brimstone breath, and void red eyes,
And lashing crimson tail, bellowed and roared,
And raked the flames with a long sooty rod.
And millions knelt to him, and with rapt cries,
As the flames clutched them, murmured, "Take us, Lord!
For Thee we fight and die, dear Fatherland and God!"

STANTON A. COBLENTZ.

World Peace

The yellow man grows tender plants
In paddy fields with bended back;
But I, with pits of molten ore,
Make bars of steel for bridge or track.

The man whose skin is black or brown
Lives simply, for his wants are few;
But I who have so very much
Am not content with all I view.

My brothers, yellow, brown, or black,
Are far apart in thought and mien;
God grant that I with beams of steel
May bridge the many gulfs between.

SARAH LOIS GRIME.

Voice of Man

The voice of man is calling
  For justice and redress,
Where mingled wrath and sorrow
  Arise in keen distress.
The unemployed are crying,—
  The youth denied a place,
And those matured in service
  Who sink in sad disgrace.

They call on earthly rulers,
  Their every hope deferred;
They cry to God in heaven
  And hear no answering word;
For clouds of disappointment
  Have hid the light of dreams,
Although in souls undaunted
  A ray of promise gleams.

Then let us rise proclaiming
  Thy truth with one accord,
For who shall go and lead them,
  If not Thy Church, O Lord?
By faith we see in vision
  The goal of brotherhood,
In love we gain as comrades
  A kingdom great and good.

CHARLES GUSTAV GIRELIUS.

We Live by All This Living World

JOHN MALICK

We are thinking of how much of the world we use. Of how much could we say, "It is no concern of mine. I have my plot which I till and will not be beholden to anything on earth or under the heavens; independent, self-contained, self-sufficient." We hear this position on the lips, "We have our local soil and rocks, rainfall, bugs, and worms; live by our local products; fight our local wars; have our home peace and schools." The chief difficulty about this is to find local things to live by that exist just close around with no far relations. We look about for some local thing and find only local minds but little else that fit the meaning of the word. It would take a million miles to bound all that the body lives by which carries about the most local mind.

There is no local soil. The forces that made the smallest plot anywhere are those that lifted and sunk a continent and carved out the valleys. You have to know what the ocean was and the ice-sheets were to know your little acre. It must be interesting to the old earth gods, ice gods, and storm gods to hear that called local soil on which they have played for a million years, boiling, blowing, freezing, covering, and denuding it. Those who use their local soil locally soon will have no soil to use. Disregard the far relations of the home place, and you have to go over into the next state to find your farm, or hire a flat boat and haul it back up the river from the Gulf of Mexico.

There is no local water supply in one's well with the Old Oaken Bucket. Some one far away will draw off the vein or pollute it a thousand miles up the valley. It is a vast system, this rain business, that runs from mid-ocean to the gates of the sun. All the mountain heights, the clouds in the sky, the great central fire, all that pulls, all the winds that blow, are a part of the system of evaporation, condensation, and precipitation.

Only Simple Simon goes out with his little pot of poison to save his own potatoes and roses. The home place cannot look after such things. Some little devilish mite takes passage as stowaway, without knowledge of captain or purser, lands and a new pest runs from Boston to Seattle taking every leaf of the particular thing it likes. The dirt farmer of New Hampshire has only one internationalism, and dislikes all others. From his journals he knows the thing that is on the way from Europe and Asia to feed upon his apple trees. But for this, all beyond his town could drop into the earth with all its products, leagues, courts, covenants, and cultures. Bugs in apple orchards are his only known far relations, an internationalist only as to pests. If he will not live by Europe and Asia, his wider relations, he must suffer by them.

That we live by all the world in pepper, coffee bean, ivory, silk, and rubber, is known from the geographies in the grades. Men wade the whole day-stretch to plant the rice; turn their houses into nurseries for the silk worm. Ships ply the seven seas with their cargoes for table, wardrobe, and medicine chest. The telephone company displays in the window where all the parts came from, and they come from everywhere. Only all the jutting land and the intervening lapping sea are large enough now for a civilized being to live by. Table, wardrobe, medicine cabinet, music room, library, and school would be scanty enough if any place were left with but its own local products. We live by all the world, and by more of it as we live the more. All the rules to shut stuff in and out are right about face toward where we came from. It is not even heading in the right direction. The whole movement to live locally in self-sufficiency in township or nation is in the direction we came from, a cave with bones on the floor.

But all this does not begin to cover the territory from which we draw. All this domestic scene has foreign relations, farther off and out. Where would all the products of all the lands be, if the sun poured its beams direct upon us in perpetual day? The very basis of our life is this turning ball that gives the alternation of day and night, wakefulness and sleep. Where would the spring be if this ball were not tilted at an angle, sending the more direct rays seasonably from Capricorn to Cancer, warming up the region toward the poles? We live by virtue of a revolving ball tilted at an angle with reference to the Sun. We live by virtue of a balance established among all the planets, stars and galaxies, each with its attraction and repulsion, pulled to and shoved away, establishing these orbit tracks in which they all spin, and we have our little spin, held to our little orbit by virtue of them all. We live by the last and farthest motion of the earth and by all its motions. Wherever that comes from by which we move; wherever light comes from for feeding vitamin and piercing ray; wherever that comes from which puts the inner pull in the atom and breaks it apart, making about all that happens here, we live by all that, and that seems to be about all the universe.

Gradually we are creeping up on, peeping into, how the whole is knit, how it fits and hangs together. It took a long time to learn a matter so simple as how birds and trees are related, and what part is played by the bees. Making honey was long thought to be what bees are for, but that turned out to be only nature's bribe of sweetmeat to keep them going from flower to flower, their major business. It took a long time to see the relation of these distributors on the wing to fruit and clover. As late as Herbert Spencer, it came to be known how such seemingly unrelated things as cats, mice, bees, and clover are closely interlinked.

Then, before we had this half worked out, how we live by all on the earth, we had thrust upon us that we live by all the stratosphere and all beyond that, sun spots, all whirling things in space, all the rays of various sorts coming from out somewhere, making our skin and blood count. The discovery is that we never have lived here locally but always by the whole scheme of things entire. We dramatized it by starting the Chicago Exposition with a ray of light that had been a long time on the way. But the rays always had been coming. It was only the Exposition that was new. They had been coming, starting and running this whole earth show for a million years before Chicago was on the map. Go out any night, and seeing the star is just being hit in the eye by rays that had been ten years on the way and just arrived that night. It is a large

world; it all hangs together, and, it seems now, we live by all of it that we have found and have lived by it all the time we have been finding it.

It was a pleasing conceit of those long before us that they lived by some sort of commerce with the sky. Wholly unrelated to things on the earth, their gods dwelt there and emerged occasionally for some striking deed, punitive or beneficent. It is not just a fancy of ours now that we live by all the forces of the upper air and far spaces, quite as much as by the products of China and Brazil. The fine old prophecy, a new heaven and a new earth, proceeds apace out of the field of rhetoric to recorded fact. Just now the new heaven is proceeding much more rapidly than the new earth. We have been learning more, faster, in the last five years, about how we live by all the forces of the sky than we have been learning in that time how to live by all the products of the earth. It does not match at all to have our masters of commerce going back to self-sufficiency, in some little division of this speck of dust, at the very time our other masters are bringing out the story of our living by all that beats upon us from distant solids and interplanetary space.

All the older figures would have it that life is a form of animated mud, a way of holding dust together as it goes from dust to dust. From savage to Hebrew sage, it was shaping mud into form much as the potter does. It seems now that this is not the way it is. The figure is much more pleasing than that. The truer figure is, and it is not a figure but a fact, that we are literally traps to catch the sunbeams. Before our local dust was, the sunbeams were.

The reservoir on which we draw is not just the sixteen miles between our lowest ocean depth and mountain height, nor that film around where the clouds are, or that top we call the sky. Neither is the stratosphere the last region out for us. There is not anything out there, however far or fast, hot or cold, that we do not live by quite as surely as by the early fruits of Georgia and Tennessee.

We are just beginning to live by the new heaven knowingly, and in reality, as those before said they did without knowing how. From the laboratories and observatories of California now comes that which puts meaning under, "I will look unto the heavens whence cometh my help," and, "I will look up." Our very life is seen to come from the direction they expected help through only occasional visitor and voice. We have sky visitors, not occasionally but constantly, playing upon us every second.

"My wealth is constant. I possess
No petty province but the whole.
I have a stake in every star;
In every beam that fills the day."

Totalitarian Pacifists

ELLEN HORUP

[Special Correspondent of Unity]

People who would call themselves pacifists must have as their motto the phrase in the constitution of the International Labor Office: "Since the aim of the League of Nations is to introduce universal peace, and such peace can only be based upon social justice . . . . this office has been established."

Social justice was not mentioned at the recent Brussels Congress of Peace. The four points of the Congress had nothing to do with justice; nor had the admired and beloved Lord Cecil. One cannot nowadays be both pacifist and conservative. One cannot vote for the armament of one's own country and at the same time hold peace congresses where one of the points is the reduction and limitation of armaments.

The Congress was to have been held at Geneva, but the Fascist President Motta was afraid that words might fall which would grate on the ears of those neighbors who mean war when they say peace. Therefore he forbade it. The Belgian Government allowed it to be held, but forbade the use of such words.

And so at Lord Cecil's World Assembly for Peace, no one spoke any of the words that should have been spoken. Only one thing was attained: Unanimity about nothing. Nor could there have been agreement about anything else! For the peace Lord Cecil talks about is not peace. It is the conservatives' maintenance of the *status quo*, and that is war, competitive warfare between the capitalist countries, class warfare between capital and labor, the *localized* warfare of the League of Nations in China, Ethiopia, Palestine, and Spain, and torture and murder in the Fascist countries, in the colonies, and in the mandatory countries.

Such is Lord Cecil's peace, and the peace of the League of Nations, and the peace of those who support them! There were not a few of them in Brussels. There were generals, statesmen, and politicians, famous for their achievements in 1914. There were people from the war industries and from *Le Temps*, the organ of the Comité des Forges. They could meet with perfect assurance, for the committee of the Congress had agreed among other things that no attack should be made on the League of Nations, on any statesman, on any country whatsoever, or on the armaments industry.

There were also many real pacifists at Brussels. They had come along in good faith, thinking that every assembly of people crying peace is propaganda for peace. What a mistake! A peace congress at which neither the abolition of war nor the causes of war are mentioned only makes for confusion. As you have seen from the newspapers, the Indian, South African, Jewish, East Indian, and Arabian delegates, and the American League against War and Fascism protested.

Assemblies are all right, but assemblies composed of all kinds of people, from all camps, blur both the aim and the object. Such was the Congress in Brussels.

In Paris, on November 18 and 19, it was the absolute, or totalitarian, pacifists who met in order to prepare for their Congress next May. These are the

100% pacifists, demanding complete disarmament, the abolition of the army, of all armies, the destruction of all munition factories, and disobedience to every mobilization order. Their five points directly attack war. This is the true war against war. There is no room for compromises, there is no "making terms." With their five points they sift the chaff from the wheat, the out-and-out pacifists from those who want peace but an armed peace.

The five points formulated by the *International Assembly against War and Militarism* may be taken as a scale. It begins right at the top with the infinitely distant aim: the abolition of war and all appertaining to war in laws and constitutions. A little lower down comes: total and immediate disarmament. That too seems to be extraordinarily remote. The abolition of conscription brings us at once nearer to earth. There is no conscription in England or in the colonies or in the United States. The last two points concern objection to military service. Every pacifist must have the right to object to serve, and those who are at present in prison must be released immediately.

With objection to military service we have arrived at the means which every one has at his disposal, the weapon used by Gandhi, the only weapon which neither wounds nor kills, the weapon of non-coöperation, of refusal. The conscientious objector need not overthrow the government, nor alter the law, nor introduce a new constitution. He does not become like the others—a number, one of a crowd, a sheep herded he knows not where. He is the solitary individual who has taken his stand in accordance with his own conscience and in defiance of the laws of the land. He does not rush off when mobilization orders arrive and the entire population has lost its senses. He made his decision while all was still calm around him, and he was quiet within. He remains standing while the others flock. He is strong because his mind is balanced. He knows what risks he is running: contempt, punishment, imprisonment, and sometimes death, but he also knows that he is not exposing others than himself, and he does this of his own free will. He is the vanguard, he is not fighting for a fatherland but for all humanity.

The totalitarian pacifists do not march against any other country; they will not enter upon any war to preserve either freedom or peace. So long as people can be conscripted and forced to go to war, there is no freedom for them to defend. "It was war that turned free people into slaves," says Schopenhauer. And Peace!—yes, if they must go to war in order to preserve it, then they themselves are breaking it.

The *International Assembly against War and Militarism* is the logical outcome of a whole series of other associations: The War Resisters' International, The International Anti-Militarist Bureau, Ossietzki's No More War, the Joint Peace Council where, in conjunction with the Quakers, the Clerical Anti-Militarist International, and the Women's Guild, they have issued a manifesto against conscription and the militarization of youth, signed by Jane Addams, Selma Lagerlof, Fenner Brockway, Kagawa, Tagore, and many others.

The meetings in Paris were presided over on the first day by Felicien Challaye, and on the second day by the Dutchman, De Ligt. There were representatives from the American Quakers, from the English Christian Pacifists, from Spain, Germany, France, Holland, Sweden, Denmark, etc. Challaye's paper, *Le Barrage,* was amalgamated with *La Patrie Humaine,* which became the organ of the association. The motto of *Le Barrage* was the words of Bertrand Russell: "Not one of the evils which one attempts to eradicate by the help of war is so great an evil as war itself." The words of Anatole France: "You think you are dying for the fatherland, whereas it is for industry," head *La Patrie Humaine.*

"There is no such thing as a righteous war," says De Ligt. "Even the most just cause cannot be defended with modern technical weapons without becoming unjust."

Regarding the colonial question, the totalitarian pacifists are quite clear. The International Anti-Militarist Bureau in Holland has as its slogan: "The Dutch East Indies free from Holland." "If nothing can move us for national defense, ought we to go to war in order to keep our colonies, which we took by force and which we retain with weapons?"

"We will not agree to another last war," says Challaye, "no matter if they call it a war of liberation, a revolutionary war, a war to eradicate Fascism, or to save the world revolution. We will no longer turn to those pacifists who, in order to secure their so-called peace, reckon with the collective application of murder, mutilation, and destruction, who agree to prepare for the final war by the murderous methods we now see being employed in Spain. Never yet has the amassing of war materials prevented a war. We will not have such pacifists among us, not even those from the extreme left, none of them who agrees once again to lay the terrible trap for the poor ignorant masses."

"Pacifism is rubbish," say the very wiseacres who have turned the world into a madhouse. But when the experts themselves, such as the Englishman, Air-General Groves, in the *Observer,* must admit "that armaments create more illusion than safety," then there is scarcely any way out than that which the pacifists have chosen: To attempt to disarm the madmen by being wise themselves.

Copenhagen, Denmark.

Tom Mooney

Release Tom Mooney! Free this tortured man!
What swinish lies hold him behind the bars,
Denied the rapture of the woods and stars,
The fellowship with men in God's great plan?
No longer must he suffer for blind fears,
Of devotees of class and wealth and sport,
And jungle ethics and inane careers
In costly club and millionaire resort.

The sacred, vested rights of property,
The holding of a piece of holy earth
Decreed this humble man must not be free
Because his kind might claim a better birth.
O Justice, tear away his prison gate
Restore a wronged man to his free estate.

EDWIN BARLOW EVANS

My Russian Impressions*

RABINDRANATH TAGORE

Translated from the Original Bengali by Basanta Koomar Roy

Copyright, 1937, by Basanta Koomar Roy

Author of "Rabindranath Tagore: The Man and His Poetry"

V.

I wrote a long letter to you from Moscow describing some of my impressions of Russia. If that letter reaches its destination you will get some news of Russia. I have given you a faint idea of the kind of work that is being done for the all-round welfare of the farmers in Soviet Russia. When I came in direct contact with the class of people that in India are dumb and ignorant and deprived of all the opportunities of life to find both their mind and heart, submerged under the miseries of the world, then I came to realize how abundantly the wealth of the human mind remained dormant on account of the negligence of human society—and how endlessly wasteful is this negligence, and how inordinately cruel is its injustice!

I went to visit a Peasants' House in Moscow. It was somewhat like a club house. Such houses are scattered all over the towns and villages of Russia. Provisions are made in these houses for instruction in farming and sociology. The illiterate are educated here. In different classes the farmers are taught the scientific methods of farming. In every such house there are also natural, social, and other educational museums. And besides, the farmers are properly advised in these houses on all the problems of their needs, necessities, and requirements.

When the farmers visit cities they can stay very reasonably in these houses, for at least three weeks. By such an extensive achievement, and thus by awakening the minds of the lately illiterate farmers of this country, Soviet Russia has laid a deep and broad-based foundation for the universal rebirth of society.

When I entered the Peasants' House I found a few eating their meals in the dining room, and a group reading newspapers in the library. I went upstairs and sat in a spacious room. They all gathered there. They came from different parts of the country. Some came from the distant provinces of Russia. They were so natural in their behaviour. There was not the least trace of nervousness in their movements.

The manager of the House spoke by way of introduction. Then I spoke. Then they began to ask me questions.

The first question one asked me was: "Why do the Hindus and the Mahomedans fight in India?"

"When I was young," I replied, "I never noticed such barbarities in India. In those days, both in the cities and in the villages there was never any lack of friendship between these two communities. In each other's festivities each was most hospitable to the other; and in the joys and sorrows of life they were one. I see such ugly fights with the birth of political agitation for self-government in India. Whatever may be the immediate causes for the inhuman misdemeanor amongst these neighbors, the fundamental cause is the lack of education amongst the masses of our land. The degree of education that is necessary to banish such arrant stupidity from a country has not yet been extensively introduced in India. I am simply surprised at what I see in your country!"

"You are a writer, have you ever written anything about the farmers of your country?" "What is going to happen to them in the future?"

"Not to speak of writing, I am working for their improvement. Whatever little lies within my individual power I spread education amongst them; and I help them for the improvement of the villages. But my attempts are very insignificant compared to the great intensive and extensive system of education that you have built up in your country in such a surprisingly short time."

What do you think of the collective system of farming that is being tried in our country?"

"I have not yet acquired enough experience to be able to express my opinion on this subject. I want to hear from you. I want to know if this new system is in any way trespassing upon your own wishes on the subject?"

"Don't the people of India know about the collective system; and of the other experiments that are going on in Russia?"

"Very few in India are educated enough to know of such things. And besides, for various reasons, news about Russia is suppressed in India by the British government. And whatever we hear is not at all trustworthy."

"Didn't you know of the existence of the Peasants' Houses in Russia before?"

"It was after my arrival in Moscow that I first came to know of the great work that is being done for your welfare. Now, you must answer my questions. What is your opinion regarding the success or failure of the collective system of farming; and what are your wishes in the matter?"

A young farmer from Ukrania said: "I am working on a collective farm established two years ago. There are farms and orchards on this farm. We supply the factories with fresh vegetables. These vegetables are canned there. Besides, there are vast wheat farms. We work for eight hours. We have a holiday every fifth day. We produce at least twice the crops that we harvested in the individual farms in our neighborhood.

"In the very start they amalgamated the farms of one hundred and fifty farmers. In 1929 half the farmers took back their farms. The cause for this was that our officers, according to Premier Stalin, did not act properly. In his opinion the fundamental principle of collective farming must be a voluntary social union. But in many instances the government officials violated this fundamental principle, so in the beginning many farmers left the union of collective farming. Afterwards, one-fourth of them gradually returned to the folds of collective farming. Now we are more powerful than ever. We have begun building new homes, new dining rooms and new schools for the members of our union."

Then a peasant woman from Siberia spoke: "I am working for collective farming for about ten years. Please remember that collective farming is very closely

*Written in the period of 1930.—Editors.

allied with the various attempts for the improvement of the conditions of women. During the last ten years the condition of the women farmers of Siberia has changed considerably. They are more self-reliant than ever before. The women that are backward, the women that are the chief impediments of collective farming, are being converted by our women. We have organized volunteers for this work. They travel about in different provinces. They work among the women; and explain to them how their minds and financial condition can be improved by collective farming. For the convenience of the women workers of these farms, every collective farm has established a children's home, a children's school, and a community kitchen."

In the province of Sukhoj there is a famous state agricultural experiment station by the name of Gigant. A farmer from there thus told me of the spread of the collective farm system in Russia: "Last year 3,000 farmers worked on our farm. This year this number has somewhat decreased; but we expect a much richer crop. For we are using scientific manuring and motor ploughs. We have more than three hundred such ploughs. We work for eight hours a day. Those that work for more than eight hours are paid for the overtime. During the winter we do not have to work much. Then the farmers migrate to the cities and work on road-building or road-repairing and other works of that nature. Even during this absence the farmers receive one-third of their regular salary; and their families are allowed to reside in their allotted homes."

"Please tell me openly and frankly," I said, "if you have any objection or willingness to surrender the title to your own farms to the coöperative farming system."

At the request of the Manager, the farmers expressed their opinion by raising their hands. Thus it became evident to me that there were many who objected to the coöperative system. I requested them to tell me the causes for their objections; but they could not explain themselves satisfactorily. One said: "I do not understand these things well."

I could well understand that the cause of opposition was in human nature. The attachment for one's own property is inborn with us. This cannot be settled by debates. We want to express ourselves, and property is a means for this self-expression.

They are great indeed who control higher means of self-expression than property. They do not care for property. They do not have the least objection to losing all their property. But to an ordinary man his property is his language of self-expression. He is sure to become dumb if he loses it. If property was only for one's livelihood and not for one's self-expression then it could be easily made plain by argument that by the renunciation of one's ownership to property his means of livelihood could be enriched.

The highest means of self-expression are knowledge and good qualities. No one can rob a person of these by force. But one can be deprived of his property by force or by dishonesty. That is the reason why, on account of partition and enjoyment of property, human society suffers a great deal from so much cruelty, from so much deception and so much heartless quarreling.

The remedy perhaps lies in the middle path. That is to say—man should have a right to the ownership of his property, and yet his freedom for the enjoyment of his own property should be limited. The wealth beyond this limit should be allowed to go back to the society. Thus the ownership of property can be saved from degenerating into greed, dishonesty, and cruelty.

In order to solve this problem of property, Soviet Russia refuses to acknowledge the very existence of this problem. So there is no end of oppression. One cannot claim that man should have no individuality; but one can claim that man should have no selfishness. In other words, the individual needs something for himself; but all beyond that margin should be for the public. Harmony in society is possible only when we fully recognize the rights of both the individual and the community. The moment we want to ignore the one or the other we are at once in conflict with the truths of human nature. The peoples of the West have too much faith in force. In its own sphere of activity force is of great value; but when it travels in other spheres of life, it causes much danger. The more violently we try to unite the power of truth with the power of physical force, the more violently they are sure to part some day.

"I still own a farm of my own," said a farmer from the Bashkir Republic, "but I shall soon join the coöperative farming system. For I see, myself, that a bigger, a better, and more varied crop can be harvested in the coöperative system than in individual farming. The cause for this is not far to seek. In order to cultivate farms well, we need farm machinery. The owner of a small farm cannot afford to buy such machines. And more than that, it is impossible to use machinery on small farms."

"Yesterday," I said, "I was talking with a high Soviet official. He said: 'Of all the governments in the world the Soviet government has made the most comprehensive arrangements for the all-round welfare of the women and the children of Russia.' "

"Perhaps you are striving to eliminate the responsibilities of the family by merging them into the responsibilities of the government?"

"That is not the immediate goal of our endeavors. But if by the expansion of our responsibilities to the children the boundaries of our families some day naturally vanish, then it will prove itself that, because of its own narrowness and incompleteness, the era of the family life has voluntarily merged itself into the greater life of the new age."

"I would like to know what you think of this problem. Do you think you can keep the family intact, and also preserve the principle of your coöperative system?"

"How the new order in our society is exerting its influence on our family life may best be illustrated by narrating what has happened to me personally: When my father was alive, he was wont to work in the city for the six months of the winter, and I, with my brothers and sisters, was wont to go out to take care of the cattle of the rich folks. We scarcely met our father. Now this separation has become impossible. My son returns home every day from the children's school, and I see him every day."

"The quarrels between husbands and wives," said a farmer woman, "have considerably decreased, because the care and education of the children are now in the hands of the state. Besides, the Russian parents are learning well the seriousness of the responsibility of rearing children."

A Caucasian young lady said to the intepreter: "Please tell the poet that we, the citizens of the Caucasian Republic, fully realize that ever since the October

Revolution we have come to know what real freedom and happiness are. We are engaged in creating a new era for Humanity. We well understand the difficult responsibility of this undertaking; and we are prepared to make extreme sacrifices to attain our goal. Please tell the poet that the varied races of the Soviet Union want to send through him their hearty sympathies to the people of India. I can assure him that if it were possible I would not mind leaving my home and hearth, my children and relatives in order to go to India to help her people."

There was one in the company who looked like a Mongolian. When I inquired about him, this was the reply: "He is a farmer boy of the Khirkij race. He came to Moscow to study the science of weaving. After three years of study, he will become an engineer and return to his Republic. After the Revolution a large factory has been established there. He is going to work in that factory."

Please remember that the only reason why members of all different races have received such unrestricted facilities and encouragements to master the mysteries of machinery is that machinery in Soviet Russia is never used to meet the selfish ends of separate individuals. Here it is not the rich — but all of society which gains from the education of the individual. We blame the machinery for our own greed; we punish the palm tree for our own drunkenness. It is just like a teacher punishing his students for his own incompetence.

The other day I went to the Moscow Agricultural House to find it proved before my eyes that in the last ten years the Russian farmers have gone far ahead of the Indian farmers. It is not only that they have learned to read and write; but their outlook on life has entirely changed. They have become full-fledged human beings. The entire truth about the farmers cannot be told by speaking only of their progress in education. The entire country is extraordinarily engaged in advancing the cause of agriculture. Quite like India, Russia, too, is primarily an agricultural country—and on the well-being of agriculture depends the life of the nation. The Russians have not forgotten that. They are engaged in accomplishing the seemingly impossible.

The Russians are not running their agricultural work by highly-paid civil servants, as is done in India, but all who are scientifically or otherwise qualified are helping. The story and the fame of their progress in the science of agriculture has spread all over the scientific world. Before the World War the Russians knew nothing about the selection of seeds. Today they are in possession of about 30,000,000 maunds (1 maund is about 80 lbs.) of selected seeds. And again, the introduction of new grains is not confined, as in India, only to the yards of the agricultural experiment station. New grains are covering the new farms of the entire country. Great agricultural experiment stations have been established in Azerbaizan, Uzbekisthan, Georgia, Ukrania, and other far-off provinces of Soviet Russia.

It is absolutely impossible for even the most fertile imagination of British subjects like us to form the faintest idea of such great, such universal, such extraordinary, and such tireless endeavors on the part of a government to educate and to make efficient every race and every sub-race inhabiting every province of such a vast country. Before my visit to Russia I could not even think that such far-reaching changes were possible of acomplishment. The reason is that we have never seen anything remotely resembling such examples in the land of "Law and Order" where I have been reared from my early childhood.

During my last trip to England I first heard from an Englishman that Soviet Russia was making such uncommon preparations for the welfare of the public. I saw this with my own eyes—and I also saw that in their scheme of government there is not the slightest trace of race and color prejudice. It is beyond the expectation of the general public of India to receive the elaborate system of education which the Soviet government has introduced amongst even the savage tribes of the Union. And yet a tremendous amount of publicity is going on all over the world against our weakness of character, and stupidity of behavior, which emanate only from this lack of education. There is a saying in England to the effect that "It becomes easy to hang a dog, if you first give it a bad name." If all the avenues for the removal of the bad name are studiously closed forever, then life-long imprisonment and hanging from the gallows can be made to travel together harmoniously.

[*To be Continued*]

The Study Table

A Voice From the South

A Stone Came Rolling. *By Fielding Burke.* 412 *pp. New York: Longmans Green and Co.* $2.50.

Here is a great book, and a timely one. *Call Home the Heart,* by Fielding Burke—pen name of Mrs. Olive Tilford Dargan—took the public by storm. In *A Stone Came Rolling,* Ishma and Britt Hensley appear again, in a new setting. Dunmow is a North Carolina mill town. Ishma is trying to spread a spirit of rebellion among the exploited workers. Britt is cultivating a farm nearby. On a broad canvas, with power and poignancy, the author paints the growing misery of the people, as their employers, hit by the depression, cut wages again and again. In scene after scene, graphic as an etching, she increases the reader's sorrow and anger. One humane mill-owner, Bly Emberson, refuses to cut the pay below a subsistence level. The other mill-owners join to boycott him. But old Dr. Schermerhorn urges him on. He says:

"The point of difference, or guilt, between us and the originating fathers is that we know what we are doing. Thanks to our frontal expansion, we know. And we could not only do something about it, we could do everything about it. We could remove every discomfort, every anxiety, every anguish attendant on economic life."

The relation between Ishma and Britt shows that a fundamental difference of opinion need not part husband and wife, when there is real love between them, and when neither tries to tyrannize over the other. Britt does not believe in violence, and he is religious. Ishma is convinced that violence is inevitable, and that religion is the opiate of the people. Yet their love never fails. Bly Emberson has ceased to love his wife, Verna. Her ideas are wholly different from his, and she is a tyrant. Verna is the most exasperating woman the present reviewer has met in fiction, except perhaps Flora Valcour in *Kincaid's Battery,* by George

W. Cable. The detestable Flora was very bright, but had no conscience. The odious Verna has a conscience, and really means well, but brings misery to her husband and children through her stupidity, religious bigotry, sensuality, and obstinate though unconscious selfishness. There is a dramatic scene where Verna, seeing a car parked under the trees in the dark, and recognizing it as that of her daughter's lover, insists, over her husband's protest, on turning the light from their own car into the parked one. Her object is to prove that the young man has an illicit amour, and thus to cure her daughter of caring for him. Startled by the light, the girl in his arms raises her head, and Verna sees the face of her own daughter.

Under the pressure of growing suffering, a great strike starts, and spreads to neighboring towns; 20,000 workers are out; but, partly through timid and conservative leadership, partly through the unscrupulous tactics of the mill-owners, it comes to nothing. Ishma continues to emphasize that white and colored workers must unite against their exploiters, and that men must work out their own deliverance, and not await it from heaven. She believes passionately that the deliverance is near:

"The machine is hard, but I love it. It is something that is going on forever. The world will have to come under its power and adjust itself to it, as it does to the sun and the tides. Then it will be the best friend that man ever had. We say it makes us slaves. So it does. But that's its revenge for using it the wrong way, for not understanding it. Men have considered the machine only as a goods-maker. Essentially the machine is a maker of leisure, and by way of making leisure it produces goods. We must not say that a machine makes so many yards of cloth, and how shall we sell it? We must say that it makes a million hours of leisure, and how shall it be divided, and what shall be done with them?"

A colored organizer is transferred from one jail to another, with the intention that he shall be lynched on the way. His friends impersonate the lynchers, and take him out of the hands of the unresisting sheriff.

Bly Emberson, driven to distraction between his business difficulties, Verna's exactions, and unrequited love for Ishma, drowns himself, after arranging with his son to have the workers reorganize the business and run it themselves. His death, which is supposed to be an accident, calls out a widespread tribute of affection and esteem, including that of the mill-owners who have been boycotting him. Verna has the funeral conducted in accordance with her own ideas, not her husband's, and sails on, in her widowhood, still immovably self-complacent.

Dunmow has thirty-seven churches, of many denominations. None of them inspires in the worshippers any sense of duty towards the oppressed. The one pastor who really believes in human brotherhood, Father Litmore of the Episcopalian church, urges unity in love. Ishma answers, "Men can't be united in love while they are taking away one another's jobs. Compelled to take them if they can." Later Father Litmore becomes so strongly convinced of this that he invites all the other ministers and the general public to a meeting where he tells them that the Christian church now stands at the parting of the ways, and tries to rally them to the side of social justice. Not one of the other ministers responds. Some of them walk out before the end of his address. But his words sink into the hearts of some of the laymen present.

Britt is murdered by the opposition. Ishma, broken-hearted, loses for a time all interest in life. But she goes back to the mountains—Britt's country—and after a while regains her old spirit and power to work. There is a wonderful description of a mountain storm. While it rages, two young lovers find each other.

Ishma goes on with her labors in Dunmow, and wins more and more converts. As the spirit of revolt grows, the repressive measures of the employers become still more violent. Ishma is arrested, and is brutally beaten up in jail by a secret agent of the mill-owners, who is himself half in love with her. He in turn is beaten senseless by one of the guards, who has some humanity; and the story ends with Ishma's rescue from prison at the hands of her friends.

This book is a new proof of Mrs. Dargan's versatility, her power to do literary work of distinction in widely different lines. All along there has been a revolutionary streak in her writings, and the width of it has grown.

ALICE STONE BLACKWELL.

Correspondence

In Reply to the Editor and Rivera

Editor of UNITY:

It is distressing to see that UNITY has joined the reactionary and irresponsible forces headed by the Hearst press, in which some Socialists and Liberals are also found.

In the two opening editorials of the February 15th issue of UNITY, "Mexico—and Trotsky," and "The Moscow Trials," the Editor builds up yarns and hypothetical cases and gives final judgments on them. While I respect the Editor's desire to fight for the underdog who he believes has been deeply wronged by the Soviets, the problem nevertheless is a more serious one and cannot be glossed over by righteous indignation and emotional outbursts which harm the ideals advocated by UNITY. Had the writer of these two editorials studied the history of the Bolshevik party of Russia, he could not have so easily said: "Lurking in the background is the terrible memory that Lenin trusted these men who have one by one passed through the court to the firing squad, and that Lenin never trusted Stalin. . ." And he would not have lost himself in such outbursts as: "The 'red' dictatorship has now moved so far over toward the Nazi dictatorship that it is hard to discern the difference."

It is difficult to discuss an issue with a person who shakes with righteous indignation instead of taking the trouble to find the facts of both sides of the issue. Do the findings of persons like Romain Rolland, D. N. Pritt, Moritz Hallgren, and others, mean nothing to UNITY? On whose authority does UNITY condemn the Soviet leaders who have gained the love and esteem of the workers of Russia and of other parts of the world? On the authority of Friedrich Adler and Norman Thomas, who are known for their hatred of the Soviet leaders!

Of course the editorial writer waves aside Walter Duranty, Sidney and Beatrice Webb, and Anna Louise

Strong who know from first-hand information and tell a story different from that of Friedrich Adler and Norman Thomas, whose information is dubious.

In the same issue of UNITY, Diego Rivera, sketching the history of art from a Marxist point of view, attacks the Soviet Union, where the artist is really free from repression and where art is given its proper place and esteem in society. But to Rivera, Russian artists are "intellectual lackeys of Stalin, of the demagogues in the service of governments that try to deceive the proletariat and the peasantry."

I know Rivera well and have had occasion to watch his career since my first visit to Mexico in 1925. I know how the artists in Mexico feel about him. I can safely say that among the artists he is one of the most hated men in Mexico, for his selfish maneuvers and greed.

I remember in the summer of 1928, when Rivera had just returned from the Soviet Union where he expected to go to live, hearing him deliver a series of lectures on life and art in the Soviet Union. Rivera expressed himself to the effect that at that time Stalin and the Executive Committee of the Communist Party were using superhuman patience with the Trotzkyites. That was in 1928 before Rivera was showered with commissions by Dwight Morrow, Edsel Ford, John D. Rockefeller, Jr.—and the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco which is responsible for keeping Tom Mooney in jail for twenty years! Rivera, now posing as the purest of pure Communists, helped reaction in Mexico in 1929 by accepting the position of head of the San Carlos Academy at a time when revolutionists like Julio Mella were shot down in cold blood in the streets of Mexico; when the government outlawed any sort of trade unions and peasant organizations which showed independence. Persons with such records cannot be judges of the Soviet Union which is building Socialism in a way that compels even Norman Thomas to describe Russia as "a mighty bulwark against Fascism."

UNITY will do well to give more serious thought to its utterances or it will stand condemned as irresponsible and harmful to the ideals it claims to expound.

MORRIS TOPCHEVSKY.

Chicago, Illinois.

The Thomas Paine Number

Editor of UNITY:

It was a fine thing to devote the Jan. 18th issue of UNITY to the memory of Thomas Paine. I regret that none of the writers included the splendid tribute of Robert G. Ingersoll:

"Thomas Paine was one of the intellectual heroes—one of the men to whom we are indebted. His name is associated forever with the Great Republic. As long as free government exists he will be remembered, admired, and honored.

"He lived a long, laborious, and useful life. The world is better for his having lived. For the sake of truth he accepted hatred and reproach for his portion. He ate the bitter bread of sorrow. His friends were untrue to him because he was true to himself, and true to them. He lost the respect of what is called society, but kept his own. His life is what the world calls failure and what history calls success.

"If to love your fellow-men more than self is goodness, Thomas Paine was good.

"If to be in advance of your time—to be a pioneer in the direction of right—is greatness, Thomas Paine was great.

"If to avow your principles and discharge your duty in the presence of death is heroic, Thomas Paine was a hero.

"At the age of seventy-three, death touched his tired heart. He died in the land his genius defended—under the flag he gave to the skies. Slander cannot touch him now—hatred cannot reach him more. He sleeps in the sanctuary of the tomb, beneath the quiet of the stars."

We need more men like Thomas Paine in this age of ours.

GEORGE L. THOMPSON.

Randolph, Massachusetts.

* * *

Editor of UNITY:

Some years ago, occasion took me to my old home town and I chanced to drop in on the school board, of which I had once been a member. My old associates were anxious to impress me with the improvements made in the schools since my departure, which prompted me to remark, "I suppose you still teach history without referring to the only two Americans who ever contributed to the political thought of the world."

Most of the members looked at me in blank resentment, but the newest member, an Englishman long in this country, responded, "I suppose we do." Then thoughtfully, "You are counting Tom Paine as an American, I suppose. He would be the first, and the second could be none other than Henry George."

I quizzed him as to his Georgian leanings and he answered, "I reported Henry George's Manchester speech for the *Guardian*. I have never heard the answer."

This incident may interest you, since recent numbers of UNITY have paid such splendid tributes to these two neglected figures in our national saga. Your tribute to Paine was magnificent. Certainly much restitution is due him from the clergy, yet I doubt if many will follow your example.

Mr. Backus' summary was also excellent, although I have long taken exception to modern quibbles about natural and inalienable rights. I like this phraseology and think it perfectly valid for the purpose. Those who deny it usually drag in the Rousseau fable of original innocence as the basis for this denial. With or without the fable, the words ring true.

Any concept of right carries with it the concept of certain equal rights. So long as authority frankly rested on force, assertion of inalienable right would have been more or less of a joke. But when ruling classes discovered that men could be fooled more easily and cheaply than they could be coerced—when they began to talk about their right to authority, they invited a retort which is unanswerable.

Certain rights are equal and natural rights because nature has failed to indicate any basis of discrimination. If they are alienable, who is to alienate them? This reasoning may be negative, but it throws the burden of proof back where it belongs—on those who would assert a superior right.

Thomas Paine stands convicted of failing, in 1776, to express himself in the jargon of 1937, just as the wiseacres of 1937 are doubtless remiss in mastery of the jargon of 2037. My belief is that the language of the Declaration will stir men to the resistance of inequity for a good many hundreds of years to come and that no other phraseology has ever been uttered so aptly conceived for the purpose.

Forgive me for emphasizing my single dissent to a treatment of Paine's memory which commands my utmost admiration and gratitude.

H. P. BOYNTON.

Cleveland, Ohio.

Editor of UNITY:

Congratulations on your Paine anniversary number. I am busy on my book, *Religious Backgrounds* and this number adds to my Paine bibliography. I shall make special mention of it.

CHARLES A. HAWLEY.

Iowa City, Iowa.

* * *

Editor of UNITY:

Congratulations on the Thomas Paine number of UNITY. I noted your reference to Bradford's "distorted" biographical sketch of Paine. I have never read anything by Gamaliel Bradford that was not either superficial or distorted.

ERNEST M. WHITESMITH.

Bellingham, Washington.

* * *

Editor of UNITY:

Some time ago I received a circular offering a trial subscription to UNITY. Thinking I had more on hand to read than I could possibly cover, I waste-basketed it. Now that the Thomas Paine issue has come, I'm sorry I did. If one dollar was the price of the trial subscription, here it is. I like the idea of special issues devoted to special topics.

VINCENT B. SILLIMAN.

Portland, Maine.

The Field

(*Continued from Page 2*)

Hindu and another. If the proclamation means anything it means that in the temples conducted under the State aegis Harijans will offer worship precisely on the same terms as the highest Caste Hindu so called. In other words, in the house of God in Travancore henceforth there will be no distinction between man and man, there will be no Harijan and no high caste, all will be Harijans—children of God. If these are not the implications of the great proclamation, it is nothing but a mere scrap of paper. But we have no reason to doubt its sincerity or suspect any mental reservations.

The main duty of working the proclamation, however, devolves in a way upon the reformers and Harijans. They should avail themselves of the freedom in a religious, becoming, and humble spirit. Reformers should see to it that Harijans enter these temples after proper ablutions and in a clean condition. I know that this primary rule is observed more in the breach than in the performance by the vast majority of temple-going Caste Hindus. Harijans may not copy the bad manners of Caste Hindus. They should take pride in setting a good example in cleanliness both of body and heart.

The proclamation should have no political significance, as it has none. I regard it as the performance of a purely religious duty of the State. And it should be so taken and so treated by all the Hindus of the State. To give it any other color will be to destroy its great spiritual purpose and effect.

Let us hope that the example of Travancore will prove infectious and all the other Hindu States will follow suit. There is no reason why they should not. It is the privilege and duty of a Hindu prince to propound religious codes which are not inconsistent with the fundamental principles of Hinduism as derived from the Vedas and which are demanded by the spirit of the times. This must be true of all the progressive and living religions. This rule accounts for apparent inconsistencies of the different Smritis and also obvious departures from the original tenets, as even a careless student will detect even in the same Smriti. If the Hindu princes do not perform this primary function, it is not so much their fault as of the lost Brahmanhood. If the Brahmanical spirit was restored, princes would be rishis, who would take from the revenues the honest minimum necessary to support them as a commission for their labors on behalf of the ryots, and hold their revenues in trust for the ryots. They would not have private property as they possess today and feel independent of their ryots and their wishes.

But whether we reach the ideal State outlined here during the present generation or ever, surely there is nothing to prevent the Hindu princes from following the example set by Travancore, and thus hastening the day of the total removal of untouchability from Hinduism, and helping to save it from certain destruction. I would advise the responsible Hindus in every Hindu State to approach their princes and their advisers to initiate the overdue reform.

Harijan (India)

American Notes

By Sydney Strong

A Seattle group, the Peacemakers, of whom I chance to be chairman, have recently completed a campaign of peace, under the slogan, "Bury the Hatchet!" Its story will be of interest everywhere, although it especially fits Seattle, getting its name from the Indian chief, Seattle.

To three hundred leading citizens we mailed a card, three by six inches, on which was a picture of Chief Seattle, and under it the words, given here in part:

Chief Seattle's Spirit Speaks:

Hear, all citizens!
I proclaim—A Season of Peace!
Bury the hatchets!
Only a fool holds a feud!
Forget the "P.-I." strike!
Drop the mayor recall!
Water-front forces, get together!
Banish war! Be good neighbors!
Burn the tomahawks!
I command there shall be perpetual peace!
Make Seattle a Tilikum Place!

The press was generous in publishing it.

With the card was also a letter calling attention to the fact that forgiveness is a major element in religion, and calling upon all to *practise* peace.

As a second step, shortly thereafter, ten little red hatchets, about ten inches long, were purchased at the 10-cent store; mounted on cardboards, and under each hatchet was pasted the Proclamation of Chief Seattle. These were put in the hands of a handsome Western Union messenger-boy named MacLaughlin, who delivered them into the hands of the following important persons: The Mayor, the three leading City Editors, Rabbi Samuel Koch, Bishop Gerald K. Shaughnessy, Rev. E. A. Fridell, the Secretary of the Labor Council and the Secretary of the Chamber,

the Secretary of the County Commissioners, and the President of the City Council. These men were asked to lead off in a "Bury the Hatchet" Crusade. They were politely reminded, too, that Jehovah in olden times agreed to save Sodom if Ten Righteous Men should come forward! Also, they were asked to recall that Noah built the Ark BEFORE the Flood!

Next morning the "P. I." published a picture of the card and hatchet, held up by an attractive young woman, Kathleen McClure, who as Princess of Peace called out, "Let's bury those hatchets!" So, the Gospel of "Bury the Hatchet" was proclaimed to tens of thousands. So far, so good! Perhaps, the Peacemakers should have stopped at this point. One never quite knows.

The next step was to call a Citizens' Meeting in the City Park, a little plot of grass right at the center of the city, where is located the City Hall, housing the Mayor, Council, and Commissioners. Again, the press gave notice. Two hundred postcards were sent out to leading citizens, to come to a noon meeting in the name of "Bury the Hatchet." The topic given was "Some Hatchets to be Buried in 1937." Some speakers announced were James A. Duncan, Rabbi Samuel Koch, H. C. Pigott, Rev. Fred A. Hughes. Singing of songs such as "America" and "Study War No More" was promised. In the announcements were the words "Pass the word along . . . *now* is the time to bury the hatchet."

On the morning of the mass meeting, at about 11 o'clock, a large imitation postcard, four by five feet, was borne through the main streets for half a mile to the City Hall. The card also carried a red hatchet and a piece of holly. One of the boys almost shouted with joy when he showed the signature of the Mayor on the receipt. The mammoth postcard read as follows:

Address: (Postmark of Seattle)

1 cent stamp
picture of
Franklin

Hon. JOHN F. DORE,
MAYOR OF SEATTLE,
SEATTLE, WASH.

Message:

THE PEACEMAKERS
Send Greetings to
MAYOR JOHN DORE

and to all people at home and abroad, and wish for them all—

HAPPY AND PROSPEROUS
NEW YEAR

1937 should be a Year of *PEACE,* not only for our own country, but for all nations as well. Wars must be outlawed! Poverty must be abolished! Capital and Labor must coöperate! Seattle's ports must invite world's commerce!

Humanity demands that we
Bury the Hatchet!
Sydney Strong, Secy.

And, this huge postcard rests in the office of the Mayor of Seattle. The Peacemakers believe that it will be shown to many hundreds in the days to come.

Then came the last scene in the drama! And, the weather—well not too good, "unusual" it was remarked. A grass lawn in January is not the best place for an open-air meeting. Yet, that gathering will live on in the memories of many. Some of the speakers were on hand. The others were really sick—not playing possum. Dr. Hughes's choir—part of them—were there and led in "America" and "Study War No More." Then the weather argued the point well, that it would be best to adjourn to the Commissioners' Room on the first floor. There we talked things over for the future, and inside the City Hall we sang again "Study War No More" and "America." We were told afterwards that many doors and windows were opened to the music.

Readers of UNITY will be interested in this effort for peace. The Peacemakers of Seattle have not finished. It would not be surprising if "Bury the Hatchet" Clubs were to spring up. The idea holds the fundamental principle of total disarmament. It holds the forgiveness element of power manifested by the Quakers. It means flatly that if any one—in home, city, nation, or the world—is to expect his neighbor to disarm, he must first disarm himself. He must bury the hatchet.

At this moment this is the best "American Note" I can strike. I would be glad to send samples of the literature to any one requesting it.—508 *Garfield Street, Seattle, Washington.*

THE CHRISTIAN REGISTER
A WEEKLY JOURNAL OF LIBERAL RELIGION

To afford an opportunity of becoming acquainted with the paper under the editorship of

NORMAN HAPGOOD

The Register is offering a special trial subscription rate of One Dollar for six months.

THE REGISTER CONTAINS:
Editorial comment and articles on social, economic and religious questions of the day;
Book reviews;
News of American and Canadian Unitarian churches.

A single trial copy will be sent, free, upon request. Send for one today.

Address **THE CHRISTIAN REGISTER**
25 BEACON STREET BOSTON, MASS.